

should be eaten. Further deductions followed, of
 which the
 cases given are illustrations. As to enemies, the
 contrary senti-
 ments found place in connection with it. It
 combined directly
 with ghost fear. The sacramental notion seems
 born of it.
 When the chase was sufficiently developed to give
 better food
 the taboo on human flesh seemed no more
 irrational than the
 other food taboos above mentioned. Swans and
 peacocks were
 regarded as great dainties in the Middle Ages. We
 no longer eat
 them. Snakes are said to be good eating, but most
 of us would
 find it hard to eat them. Yet why should they be
 more loath-
 some than frogs or eels ? Shipwrecked people, or
 besieged and
 famine-stricken people, have overcome the loathing
 for human
 flesh rather than die. Others have died because
 they could not
 overcome it, and have thus rendered the strongest
 testimony to
 the power of the mores. In general, the cases
 show that if men
 are hungry enough, or angry enough, they may
 return to canni-
 balism now. Our horror of cannibalism is due to a
 long and
 broad tradition, broken only by hearsay of some far-
 distant and
 extremely savage people who now practice it.
 Probably the
 popular opinion about it is that it is wicked. It is
 not forbidden
 by the rules of any religion, because it had been
 thrown out of
 the mores before any " religion " was founded.